

August 7, 1935, by the Berg Packing Co., from Ketchikan, Alaska, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a decomposed animal substance.

On June 10, 1936, the Berg Packing Co. having appeared as claimant and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be released under bond, conditioned that it not be disposed of in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**26096. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. 1,993 Cases of Canned Salmon. Consent decree of condemnation. Product released under bond. (F. & D. no. 37745. Sample no. 52336-B.)**

This case involved a shipment of canned salmon which was in part decomposed.

On May 16, 1936, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 1,993 cases of canned salmon at New Orleans, La., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about April 3, 1936, by the Wesco Food Co., from San Francisco, Calif., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Dawn Brand Alaska Pink Salmon \* \* \* Packed in Alaska \* \* \* Packed by Sebastian Stuart Fish Company, Seattle, Wash."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a decomposed animal substance.

On June 26, 1936, the Sebastian Stuart Fish Co. having appeared as claimant and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be released under bond, conditioned that it not be disposed of in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**26097. Adulteration of crab meat. U. S. v. Twenty-two 1-Pound Cans of Crab Meat, et al. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. nos. 37746, 37751, 37752, 37784. Sample nos. 45522-B, 64233-B, 64236-B, 64237-B.)**

These cases involved shipments of crab meat that contained fecal *Bacillus coli*.

On May 16, May 18, and May 19, 1936, the United States attorneys for the District of Columbia and the District of Maryland, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district courts libels praying seizure and condemnation of 37 cans and 2 barrels of crab meat at Washington, D. C., and one tub of crab meat at Baltimore, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about May 12, May 14, and May 16, 1936, by Brunswick Fisheries, Inc., from Brunswick, Ga., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy animal substance.

On June 9 and June 25, 1936, no claimants having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**26098. Misbranding of olive oil. U. S. v. 9 Cartons of Olive Oil. Default decree of condemnation. Product ordered distributed to charitable institutions. (F. & D. no. 37747. Sample no. 59622-B.)**

This case involved a shipment of olive oil that was short in volume.

On May 18, 1936, the United States attorney for the Southern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of nine cartons of olive oil at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about January 4, 1936, by Hampden Sales Association, from New York, N. Y., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Miami Pure Virgin Olive Oil from the Finest Selected Olives. \* \* \* 2 Fluid Ounces."

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that a statement on the label, "2 Fluid Ounces", was false and misleading and tended to deceive and mislead the purchaser when applied to a product in bottles containing less than 2 fluid ounces; and in that it was food in package form and the quantity of contents